

Docket No.: 217487US2

OBLON
SPIVAK
MCCLELLAND
MAIER
A
NEUSTADT
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/051,019

Applicants: Munemitsu IKEGAMI

Filing Date: January 22, 2002

For: PRINTING SYSTEM AND METHOD RESTRICTING

FUNCTIONS OF PRINTERS, USABLE BY EACH

USER

Group Art Unit: 2625 Examiner: POON, K. Y.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

ELECTION OF SPECIES

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAHER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maie

Registration No. 25,599

ZZ85U
A13 2000 (share) Zachary S. Stern

Registration No. 54,719

Customer Number 22850 (703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

DOCKET NO: 217487US2



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

MUNEMITSU IKEGAMI : EXAMINER: POON, K. Y.

SERIAL NO: 10/051,019

FILED: JANUARY 22, 2002 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2625

FOR: PRINTING SYSTEM AND METHOD RESTRICTING FUNCTIONS OF PRINTERS, USABLE BY EACH USER

ELECTION OF SPECIES

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Election of Species requirement dated March 23, 2006, Applicant elects with traverse the Species I and identifies Claims 1-11 as readable on the provisionally elected species.

Applicant respectfully traverses the election of species requirement for the following reason.

MPEP § 803 states:

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding election of species requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner.

Accordingly, an action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:ZSS:dnf

I:\aTTY\ZS\21's\217\217487US\217487 ELECTION.DOC

Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

Zachary S. Stern

Registration No. 54,719